

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1, 4 and 9-12 are pending.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the picture display unit modifies at least one of a position or a size of the currently viewed program and simultaneously displays a remote controller operation guide with the recommended program and the modified currently viewed program. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the remote controller operation guide provides an indication for selecting between the recommended program and the currently viewed program by a remote controller. Claim 1 has also been amended to remove the phrases "automatically" and "only." Claim 4 has been amended similarly to claim 1. No new matter is introduced herein. Basis for the amendment includes, for example, page 7, line 7 - page 8, line 11 and Fig. 3 of the subject specification.

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivas et al. (US 2004/0003395) in view of Yoshida (US 5,936,611). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... wherein the picture displaying unit modifies at least one of a position or a size of the currently viewed program ...

the picture displaying unit simultaneously displays a remote controller operation guide with the recommended program and the modified currently viewed program, the remote controller operation guide providing an indication for selecting between the recommended program and the currently viewed program by a remote controller.
(Emphasis added)

Claim 4 includes a similar recitation.

Srinivas et al. disclose, in Fig. 1, device 100 for automatically displaying an indication of a recommended program to a viewer. Device 100 is connected to display 112 having main

display 113 and picture-in-picture (PIP) display 114. (Paragraphs [0025] and [0027].) Device 100 includes a recommender (processor 106) for calculating a recommendation score for received program content. (Paragraph [0026].) If the recommendation score is higher than a predetermined threshold, an indication of the received program content is displayed to the viewer. The indication can include a bottom line display, a flashing LED, an audio display, a textual message on PIP 114 (Fig. 2a) or the actual program content on PIP 114. (Paragraphs [0028-0031].)

Srinivas et al., however, do not teach that a picture displaying unit modifies at least one of a position or a size of the currently viewed program, as required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Srinivas et al. are silent regarding this feature. Srinivas et al. only teach that an actual program content of the recommended program is automatically displayed on PIP 114.

In addition, as acknowledged by the Examiner on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, Srinivas et al. do not teach displaying a remote controller operation guide simultaneously with a recommended program and currently viewed program. Accordingly, Srinivas et al. cannot teach simultaneously displaying a remote controller operation guide with a recommended program and the modified currently viewed program, where the remote controller operation guide provides an indication for selecting between the recommended program and the currently viewed program by a remote controller, as required by claim 1. Thus, Srinivas et al. do not include all of the features of claim 1.

Yoshida discloses, in Figs. 1 and 2, an on-screen displaying apparatus for displaying remote control hand unit 10 and its keypad on a screen of CRT 9. (Abstract and Column 4, lines 46-51.) Pressing a key on remote control hand unit 10 causes a corresponding key to be indicated on the display, along with a functional description of the key. (Column 4, lines 52-64 and Fig. 7 and 8.)

Yoshida, however, does not teach simultaneously displaying a remote controller operation guide with a recommended program and a modified currently viewed program, where the remote controller operation guide provides an indication for selecting between the recommended program and the currently viewed program by a remote controller, as required by claim 1. Instead, in Yoshida, an image of remote control hand unit 10 is used to highlight a user selected key and provide a functional description of the key. In addition, Yoshida does not teach a picture displaying unit which modifies at least one of a position or a size of the

currently viewed program, as required by claim 1. Yoshida is silent regarding this feature. Thus, Yoshida does not include all of the features of claim 1 and does not make up for the deficiencies of Srinivas et al. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4, although not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested for at least the same reasons as claim 1.


Claims 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivas et al. and Yoshida in view of Yeun et al. (US 2008/0184293). Claims 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivas et al., Yoshida and Yuen et al., further in view of Chang et al. (US 2002/0129362). Claims 9-12, however, include all of the features of respective claims 1 and 4 from which they depend. The remaining cited art do not make up for the deficiencies of Srinivas et al. and Yoshida with respect to claims 1 and 4. Accordingly, claims 9-12 which include all of the features of respective claims 1 and 4 from which they depend, are also patentable over the cited art.

Application No.: 10/553,613
Amendment Dated July 29, 2010
Reply to Office Action of June 2, 2010

MAT-8702US

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicant

DMG/dmw

Dated: July 29, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

951452